

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं॰ 3] No. 3] नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, जनवरी, 16 1982/पौष 26, 1903

NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, JANUARY 16, 1982/PAUSA 26, 1903

इस भाग में भिन्न पुष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रक्षा जा सके Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

> भाग II—क्षण्ड 3—उप-क्षण्ड (iii) PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (iii)

(संघ राज्यक्षेत्र प्रशासनों को छोड़ कर) केन्द्रीय प्राधिकारियों द्वारा जारी किए एए ग्रादेश ग्रीर द्वधिसूचनाएँ Orders and Notifications issued by Central Authorities (other than Administrations of Union Territories)

भारत निर्वाचन ग्रायोग

ग्रादेश

नई विल्ली, १ नवस्वर, 1981

भार भर 8.—निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि सीचे की सारणी के स्थम्म (2) में यथा विनिविद्य उत्तर प्रवेश राज्य विधान सभा के निर्वाचन के लिए जो स्तम्भ (3) में विनिविद्य निर्वाचन-केन्न से हुआ है, स्थम्भ (4) में उसके सामने विनिविद्य निर्वाचन लड़ने बाला प्रत्येक अभ्यर्थी, लोक प्रसिनिधिस्व अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित उका सारणी के स्तम्भ (5) में यथा उपविधान का में असफल रहा है :

भ्रौर उक्त श्रभ्यर्थियों ने सम्यक सूचना विए अन्ते पर भी उक्त श्रमफलना के लिए या तो कोई कारण अथवा स्वष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है या उनके हारा विए गए श्रभ्यावेदनों पर, यदि को हों, विचार करने के पण्चान् नियंचित श्रायीय कायड समाधान हो गया है कि उनके पास उक्त श्रमफलना के लिए कोई पर्योग्य कारण या न्यायौचित्य नहीं है;

ग्रात. श्राब, निर्वाचन श्रायोग उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के श्रानुसरण में नीचे की मारणी के स्तम्भ (4) में विनिर्दिष्ट व्यक्तियों की संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अथवा विधान परिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस आदेण की तारीखा से तीन वर्ष की कालाविधि के लिए निरिहित घोषित करता है।

सारगो

कम स०	निर्वाचन की विणिष्टियां	विक्षान सभा/निर्वाजन क्षेत्र की ऋ० सं० ग्रीर नाम	निर्वाचन लड़ने वाले ग्रभ्यर्थीका ना व पता	म निरहेना का कारण
1	2	3	4	5
	तर प्रवेश विधान सभा का साधारण निर्वाचन, १८०	। ५——अफजलगढ़	श्री मथुरा, ग्राम व डा० रेहड़, जिला विश्वनार (उत्तर प्रदेश)	निविचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा दाखिल नहीं किया है।
	तर प्रदेश विधान सभा का साधारण निवजित, १४०	20नगीना (ग्र० जा०)	श्री फते चन्द, ग्राम सुस्तफाबाद गर्ही, मा० सीखाखुचन्द्र, नहसील नगीना, जिला बिजनीर (उस्तर प्रदेग)	निर्वाचन व्ययों काकोई भी लेखा दाखिल नहीं कियाई।
1142	G.I./811		(33)	

निटिचिन प्रात्ता काई ⊬ा उसा । अच्चर प्रदेण वितान सभा का साधारण निवीचन क्षा भागाम्य 1 1 4-- र गला दास्ति रहा किसा । भाम वैरमण्य 1980 पाठ सम्वियाव्याभाग বিবা গ্ৰেষ্ক্) (উল্টিষ্ট্ৰ भ यामध्रीत - वर्श--- यही-। । ५- - रासपर स्पान 1 यामध्याः राभावा বিলামসাধান (সভাষ্থা)। 12 110 - रामपुरस्य स भ रामरान - - গ্র**ন্** गमबप्⊲ ११ चित्रायनापान् (अल्बरपदेणा) । - - वर्ही- -।। /- - गृत्यारा का स्वर्ग । इ —∸ দ্বাহী -स्व सैप्पटन पन्।भगः) सिटी प्रिलापग्र (उत्तरप्रदण्) । र्ध्व टरिवस्स – শৃস্*হ*ি – वर्षा--। । ५- - प्रतायगर घ∣टमप≐ भट हो, मे√हा নিশা খান্টাই (ভালন প্ৰজা) । या भवतम् नारायन —– শ্বা-ा । ⊶-क्षानापुर वहां- -ग्राम भाव। नं। पार गतिलाभज जिला प्रशासनाद (उत्तर पदेण) । -- व**र्ह**ा--। । ५५-- वीरापर यी महत्तनाम - वर्ज्ञाc, रु¦म कली**सराक्ष्यर** या० कत्रीती जिला श्नाप्रक (उचर प्रदेश) । 120--9221 - a≢1---- वर्ष:--भी खालिक 10 मैच्यदन प्रतापः इतिर्धा प्याप्यद् (उर्ज्जारा श्री शिव प्रसाद - - यर्जा-- - वर्जी- -ा प्र−गटरी 1.1 ग्राठ चान्दपुर पाठ हरि**हर**राच पन्पम्ह (अचार पदाण)। क्षी स्रेग रमा≗ - - a₹î -7년[- -1 ' 124 हर्नाती ग्राम विपाठणगई भूलक्षानपुर (उत्तरपदेश) । - व≸'---- 크취- -1 ∻3− – हाडा र्याः मन्तवश्म 33 ग्राम वारवा माभ्यक्षपुर **ণ**ে শ্বকৰ**স**ণুস चिलापैनादाद (घल्यपटण)। । ५५- - माद्रिनिनग र्म। नुर स्राती स्व। - वर्श -- 47ÉT--1.4 भगैला, साधूल्यासमय गाँग्डा (उत्तर प्रदेश)। -- বর্ঠা--श्री दक्षित नारायण-वत्भ वर्षा । ५५--मा*व्*ल्यनगर - रही---पिप्राष्ट्रमाहत. या हुल्लान्यरं, काण्डा (उन्हरं पदाण) । । ५५- – मनकापुर (य०जा०) श्रीः जिवराखन 16 -- वली--–व≸ा प्राग व पा० बभनी याननगा जिला गोण्डा (उत्तर पंदेश) । र्या णिवराम शक्ल -- यही-1 6 2-- फटरा बाजार यहा 17 याम पूर प्रतिया, पार बनगाई, जिला गण्या (उन्तर घ्रदण)। वही- --! ५३— - भरनैल गण ओ नन्ह उफ सन्य सं।इय. – কু/া-15 ग्राम व राष्ट्रव्यारासी जिला गण्डा (उभार प्रदेश)।

{भाग	rH- <i></i> ⊌>r a(in)}	भाराक(राजपत	. जनवरी 16. 1982/पीम 26 1903	35
3	· ·	3	-4	់ <u></u> - ភ
1.41	उत्तर प्रदेश ित्र ने सका का निर्माण कियाबहु (१९५०	रक्द चर्चन्द्रम	र्थः राम गासः याम वर्गा० कित्रोई कताः जिला गोण्डा (जनर प्रदेण) ।	
20	1 ž , · ·	155 - †ধ≀ ⊕িং (স্তিত্ত) श्रीसगल प्रसाद. श्राम लालपूर पोठ रामपुर जिला गोण्डा (उत्तर प्रदेण)।	वर्हा -
24	작론)	१००: अर्थ्ता	भी तेज बहादुरीसठ. सम्बद्धीरथा पूर्वा. इ.च पुरानी बर्गा(जिला अस्टो (जिसर प्रदेण)।	' - वर्हा -
2.2	€-(I) ८६ -तृस्ती	र्धाः भुरेन्द्रः बहादूर मिह याम कटरुद्राधीर सिहः भारु पित्रस्य गौतसः जिला बन्तीः (उत्तर प्रदेशाः)।	4 \$\vec{x}\) ~-
24	-/- व हैं)	। ५४ वस्ती	र्था ९चम. स्रोटिक टाला,पार प्रशासी बर्गी. जिला वस्की (उसर प्रदेश) ।	यहाँ -
24	- वर्हें।	१७० क्सिन्द∓	थी राम मिलन, याम गकड़ी भीक्षी, डा० येल,रंग, जिलाबस्ती (उत्तर प्रदेण)।	प्रहीं)
213	वहं।	ी स्ते - जोस्पे द ्	र्यः श्रीरामः, ग्रामः खटिक टालः। १/० प्रशानी बस्ताः (जना कस्ताः (उत्तर प्रदेशः) ।	वर्ही
<u> </u>	बहुँ।) ५५५ रासन्यय	र्था गर्मा <i>अल्लाह,</i> याम पिषरा, पा० करमहिषा, जिला वस्ती, (उन्तर प्रदेश)।	वर्ष्ट्रॉन -
27.	- এলী -	178 - धन्रियास्थ	थी नाथब हैंदर गाम के पीठ हरेलीर जिला बरको (जिन्हें प्रदेश) ।	યર્ત્ટા
28	-बहं।	। 70 दुमरिया∙ाज	थी शिव दुवारे, ल.ल याम सेभृवाधीला,पो० ह≂लार. जिला बस्थी, (उत्तर प्रदेण) ।	वर्र)
24	. ayr-	13 ∣- हिन्था	थी विरुष्य प्रसाद. ग्राम सभरी. पा० सहस्रेव घप्ट, जिला बर्ग्नी, (उसर प्रवेण) ।	~ – यही
.3 (+.	वरं।	1.:1- ६१७था	र्गः विजय बहादर, ग्राम फरवित्या, पो० तिरवगहर, जिला सम्बी (उत्तर पदेण) ।	– ∙व∳ा- ∙
1	- वर्रो • •	०७2८ - ही,िन्सक	भारु चजहरास्या, याम मलपहित्या,पोरु वंदहरी, जिला बस्ती (उसर प्रदेण) ।	- ন্ট্ৰ -
3.1	- वर्ह। -	१७७ - सोहराणह	धी समुख्य प्रसाद. गोम रोहमोली. पोठ सन्सास्त्र नीगढ. 1जला बस्ती (उत्तर प्रदेण) ।	अही'

1		3	4]	5
13.	ानर प्रदेश विद्यान सभा का साधारण निविचित्त 1980	1 73 सौगढ	श्री रामणंकर चौधरी ग्राम व पो० सोहास खास, जिला बस्ती, (जनर प्रदेश)।	निव्योचन व्ययों का कीई मी लेखा दाखिक नहीं निया।
3.4	ब र्लो	1 7 d− - बॉस् री	श्री जगदम्बा, ग्राम खरकोला नानकार, पो० बांसी, जिला बस्ती, (उत्तर प्रदेश)।	अ <i>है</i> †
35.	खही -	1 7 5 खेसरहा	श्री रन्स्, ग्राम बिलहर हुहा, पो० सुद्धारकवां, जिला बस्ती (उत्तर प्रदेश)।	वर्र्स
3 G.	बही	। 7 6-⊶मेहदाबल	श्री कुंबर रणजीत सिंह, ग्राम धनकसिया, पो० नीगी, जिला बर्स्फा (उत्तर प्रदेश) ।	वर्हा
37.	बही	! 7 ६∼ – केंस्टदाय प्द	श्री प्रहृलाद पाण्डेय, ग्राम कान्टी, पो० मेहवाबल, जिला यस्ती (उत्तर प्रदेण) ।	वहीं
38	वही	। 78-⊷हैदर बोजार	श्री सहदेव, ग्राम रामपुर, पौ० माधोपुर, जिला बस्ती (उत्तर प्रदेण) ।	⊸- वर्हा <i>⊷-</i> -
39.	- · ब हो	१४०—धृग्यापुर	श्री उदयभान, ग्राम व पो० कनडचा, जिला गोरखपुर (उत्तर प्रदेश) ।	य ही
40.	-वर्ह ी	1 ४० श्रुपियापुर	श्री गंगा सागर सिष्ठ. ग्राम व पो० भूषगढ़, जिला गोरखपुर (जलर प्रदेश) ।	- - चहीं
41.	– - वर्ह् रॉ-⊷-	194~चीरगिया (ऋ०जा०) श्री शिव च रन, दरबौली, पो०श्रा० छिसौनी, जिसा देवरिया (उत्तर प्रदेण) ।	- - ∙ लर्ह्
42.	व ही	195 -⊷ रामको ला	र्श्वा सारकेण्यर ग्राम वशहा खूर्व, पो० सक्ष्मीगंज,जिला देवरिया. (उत्तर प्रदेश)।	- - अही
43.	ब ह ी	195–⊷रोमकोला	श्री मोहराव. ग्राम पडरी, पो० परमौना. देवरिया पडिय, जिला देवरिया (उसर प्रदेश) ।	व <i>ह</i> ो
44.	बही	1 9 6 ⊶– স্ ােহা (য়৹জা৹)	श्री हरीम चन्द्र, ग्राम देवकली, पो० सिरमिश्रा नं० ३. जिला देवरिया (उत्तर प्रदेश) ।	वह ¹ ~ -
45.	बही <i></i> -	2 67 मेजा (फ्र ०जा०)	श्री नचक् राम, ग्राम व पौ० लोटाह, जिला इलाहाबाद (उत्तर प्रदेश) ।	- - बही~ -
46.	नर्ह् <mark>ती -</mark> -	2 स8− – कर छना	श्री मानिक चन्द्र वर्मा, ग्राम कठौली, हलाहाबाद, (उत्तर प्रदेश) ।	~त्रई।
47.	अही	268~ - क^र छन र	ग्राम श्री रखुराजमित पटेल. ग्राम झंटो, पो० रोकरी, इलाहाबोद (उत्तर प्रदेग)।	बही

			ः श्री रामणिरोर्माणः	. – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – –
48.	उत्तर प्रदेश विद्यान नभा का साधारण निर्वाचन, 1980	27 0—-ज्ञ् सी	श्चारसाधरामाणः ग्राम जमृतीपुरः, इलाहाबाव (उत्तर प्रदेशः) ।	ानवाचन व्यया का लख्या दास्थल नहा किया
49	वर्हो	27 1 न्हें डि या	श्री स्विताथ पण्डे बैविक, ग्राम जलालपुर, गो० परदापुर, तहसील हॉड्या, इलाहाबाद (उत्तर प्रदेश)।	ब ही -
50	রন্থি	2 7 1हंशिया	श्री प्रेम शंकर, याम माधोपुर निवादीह, पा० बरीड, मह० हॅडिया, इला हाबा द (उत्तर प्रदेश) ।	बर्ह्ग'
51-	वर्ष्ट्रा	271 हॉडिया	र्था राम किसोर, ग्राम प्रहरीबीझ,पां० मडवा, इलाहाबाद (उत्तर प्रदेश) ।	वहीं
5.2		2 7 २ परतापुर	श्री नरीतमः, ग्राम सेमरी, पी० प्रतापपुरः, इलाहाबाद (उक्तर प्रदेगः) ।	बहुँ!
53-	_ _ च ह ँ,	2 7 ५ परनागुर	श्री राणिद हुसैन, (15 दाराशाह भानम ऋर्णा इलाहाबाद) अब 513 श्री, नई बस्ती, 1 सदर दाजार, लखनऊ (उत्तर प्रदेश)।	− − खर्ही/− ;
51	ब हीं⊶ -	2 7 3मोराब	श्री जमुना प्रसाद, ग्राम रानीनार, पो० श्रा० महरऊन्ड, वह० साराब, इलाहाबाव (उत्तर प्रदेश)।	- - वर्ह ो
ถื ลี.	वही	273⊶सोरॉव	श्री राधेक्याम वर्मा, ग्राम रामपुर उर्फ दौलतपुर, पो० सिकन्दरा, तह० फूलपुर, इलाहाबाद (उत्तर प्रदेश)।	⊸⊸वर्ह /⊷-
56-	वर्ह् _।	275 इल√हाबाद उत्तर	श्री नन्दलाल चौबे, 19, ग्रुमती महात्मा गोश्री मार्ग, इलाहाबाद, उत्तर प्रदेश ।	⊸थ हों
57.	वर्मा	276 इलाह्यबाध दक्षिण	श्री महेंब्रसिह, 113,पानवरीबा, ब्लाहाबाद (उत्तर प्रदेश)।	– -वर्ह्°
5 &-	बही ' -	276 इलाहाबाद दक्षिण	श्री राजन उर्फ राज्, पश्चिम एग्रीकल्चर इन्स्टीच्य्ट, महवा, इलाहाबाद (उत्तर प्रदेश) ।	य हो
59.	––चर्ह [°] -⊶	277६लाहाबाद पश्चिमी	श्री बन्सदेव, ग्राम तिपरा, पो० गांजा, इलाह्यबाद (उत्तर प्रदेश) ।	—- अ ह ि~ _
60.	- - वर् हो	277 इलाहाश्वाद पण्चिमी	श्री बिन्देश्वरी प्रसाव कुशवाहा, मन्दरदेह माफी, इलाहाबाद (उत्तर प्रदेण) ।	वहीं
61.	बर्हो	27 7-⊷इलाहाबाद पश्चिमी	श्री बृत्तेश कुमार, 304, ममपोर्ड गंज, इलाहाबाद (उत्तर प्रदेश) ।	⊶-व ह ो≂

38		INDIA : JANUARY 16, 1		[PART II SEC. 3 (iri)
1	<u>2</u>	3	l 	5
62.	उत्तर प्रदेश विधान स्मावत साथारण निवासाय, 1980	2.7 7- −६ेज।हात्राव पण्चिम्.	अः रशन धेकाण राज्य उर्फ भृष्यः । ३. कटरा रोष्टः इलाहाबाद (उत्तर प्रदेण) ।	तियः,अने ब्ल्योः काचेश्व कश्चित्र सद्घीकिका
63	वर्षः ·	277 इलाहायाद पश्चिमी	र्था हरिण्चाद्र. चापलाखास इलाहाबाद उत्तरप्रदणाः	- ਕੁੜਾ – –
64	⊬ - वर्ष्टा∼ -	७७५ मेझनकुर (आ०क्षा०)	श्री पुण्नमल, ग्राम व पी ० स्थारा, मैंट्यदपुण, तहसील मझनपुण, इसाहाबाद (उत्तर प्रदेण) ।	नेम्
65	_ — अ र्ही⊤ -	282 किण्नुनेपुर	र्श्वामनी जनक दुलारी. उर्फ शिक्षान देखा. मे बे बे ट्रा. ऐसम्बरपुर. कस्या (बन्दकी, फनेह्रपुर उत्तर प्रदेश।	य <i>र^î</i> *—
66	- · वहाँ- <i>-</i>	284- फर्ते झपुर	र्थाः कश्ण शकर, याम लालापुर, पो० हुसैनगज. जिला फते∦पुर (धन्तर प्रदेश)	– ७ श्रहीं ७
6.7	वर्हो	2 सध⊷ - विन्दर्का	श्री मंगल. ग्राम भ(कपुर. पो० गौहाट, जिला फतेहपूर. उत्तर प्रदेण।	यहीं
68-	वर्हा	3 o 1 प्र िया	श्री जनत न(रायन भौ० भ्डाई, कस्बा ग्रोरेया. जिला ७टावा (उसर प्रदेण)	- वर्डॉ
69.	अर्हो	3().}− − लखना (ऋ०जा०)	श्री बज किशोर शंखवार. ५.४-प्रकालगज. इटाया, उभर प्रदेश।	. य <i>र्</i> के –
70.	अ ही ·-	· 305 भ्रमकृत न् <i>नर</i>	र्थः राम दास काजपेयः, निरहोत्ता भिड्स्थर, हेवरा,धटावा, उसर प्रकेण।	यहीं -
71.	- – बर्ही	,३० ५००∼ जस्यल्य नभ्र	शीः जान्द्र कृमार दुवे. बरालोकपुर, इटावा (उत्तर प्रदेश) ।	–পর্কো
72.	- - वर्श	30.6~ - भर्षना	श्री उजागर गिह, नेगला गुरुतातपुर, बीवा मार्फः, पोठ उमरन, जिला इटावा उत्तर प्रदेश।	- • बंही
73.	बही	306~~ सर्थना	श्री प्रेम सिह, हाम परस्थोली श्रीउमपूर, पोठ लखना, जिला इटाबा. उरार प्रदेश।	· – व <i>र</i> ि
7 4.	. व र्हो	3 त ७-⊷ भण्छना	श्री मन्मोहन राम. ग्राम एखा कडली पोठ एखा कटरा, जिला इटाबा (जन्मर घटेण)	– √प्रहो - ·
75.		3 0 7~ - विध्ना	श्री रा मचन्द्र शादव, ग्राम माखन का भृषा गाँ० मल्होंगी, स्टावा	작한

(उत्तर प्रदेश) ।

िमाग	[[खण्डः ३(iii)]	सारत था राजपत	अन्वरी 16 1982/पौण 26 1903	3
		1	1	5 5
7、	उत्तर प्रदेश विद्यान सम्भाषाः सः एशानिक्षीचनाः १५० स	+0 7 विधना	्र्य (भवक्ष्याल प्रश्नी गाम भृवांनका पारु दुवार्ग रा एटावा (उत्तर प्रदेश)।	- निर्माचन त्र्यप्रो का लेखा दाखित नहीं किया
-	- ग्रन्थ -	राष्) - ऽसंग्दा	थी बलराम मिट पृत और मिजाजी लाल, निवासी राज्यांत्र्यापुर (बलनपुर) पोरु बगानपुर जिला फेम्बाबाद, पारु बलनपुर जिला फेम्बाबाद, र उसर पदका) र	- 、वही
- <	- প্ন -	१०७ ° भ ⁷ %1	श्री २नर्ब र सि.८ पुर्श रामसनेष्ठी लाल, सिवासी सीरिख,पो० सीरिख जिला फरकाक्षाद (उत्तर प्रदेश)।	क वर् श
7 4	- 47	११∣− ४म्लानिज	श्र जनारंन , कंरतपुर साकत गज फरम्थावाव (उत्तरप्रदण))	* **
811	पत्नी	१) !इसाल्टर	श्रो (धर्मोद दत्त , रजीपूर, फरुखाबाद (उत्तर धर्देण) ।	व≱ि⊸-
٧)	ब र्ग	४।३ −फ्रश्चा∉ाद	र्था प्राफनाव मर्लला, कटरा ब म्रली खी, जिला फरखाबाद (उत्तर मेदेण)।	বর্ম-
	– सर्हा-	१। १- कॉयगगज	र्शःमती ज्ञानी परनी श्री सत्य प्रकाण दुवे निवासी फतेहपुर, परिश्रीली, काश्मरोज जिला फस्याबाद (उत्तर प्रदेण) ।	- <i>-</i> यही- <u>-</u>
. 1	वर्ह -	४। ये −मीक्रम्पदाबाद	र्ध नामपरसिंह राष्टीर राम समेथापुर डा० कनासी, जिला फम्खाबाद, (उत्तर प्रदेण)।	बर्ही
S I	- यह ^न	८ : ५ झार्सी	थीः ग्लर्म्सा लाल गोपाल नीस्रारा, आर्सा (उत्तर प्रदेश) ।	ब ही
۶-	न ुर्व ।-	'⊻≒ झासी	श्री हरियाम, 585 ग्राम विछोरण सामी उत्तर प्रदेण।	agl
×10	वर्ह्स -	०३५ र स⊀ैट	र्धा माने लास, ग्रा० भीनपुर, डा० भ⇒पुरो, एटा (उत्तर प्रदेण) ।	वर्षे (
ζ-	वर्ट।	४३६ स्थेरा	श्री प्रमोट कुमारे गुप्ता, श्रमापुर, जिला एटा, उत्तर प्रदेश ।	बहो -
84	् व <i>∮</i> ा	४ ६० सोटा	श्री रपुरावसिह नगला यदन, डा० बाजनगर. जिला पना (उत्तर प्रदेश)	·वर्हा
4	•) - वहां	। ३७≁ - कांगगंज	श्री अय दयाल सिंह, श्रजुब्या भवन गेंट, कासगंत्र, एटा, उत्तर प्रदेश ।	বহুন

	उत्तर प्रदेश विधाम सभा का	147 - पासगत	श्री रा _ो क्यर सिह,	निर्वाचन व्ययाकालेस
₹	प्राधारण निर्वाचन १७४०		ग्राम नरौला डा० (क्सरौली जिलाएरा (उत्तरप्रदेण)।	द(सिश्वन नर्ही विश्वा
91	—वहीं —	3 18 परा	श्री जन्दन सिंह, याम लनगला प्रेमी डा० द्वाम (जना षटा, (उत्तर प्रदेश)।	—- च र्श्री ~
92	वही 	3 18 n e t	श्री लाखन सिंह, डी० एस०एस० यादव बागरा रोड एटा, उत्तर प्रदेश ।	- वर्ह° -
F Q	वर्ही	350- - जलेमर (६० जा०)	श्री बाबू लाल, मो० ग्रक्षबस्पुर हचेश्री, कस्बा जलसर एटा उत्तर प्रदेश।	 वहीं
44	- वर्षाः—	३६8- ≱ाथरस	र्था नन्ह नेता उर्फ सोना राम गली बख्ताबर, हाश्ररम, (उत्तर प्रदेश) ।	वहीं
95	बही	४७५ - सासनी (भ्र०की०)	डा० यादरामसिह, ग्रा० नकायन, पो० हम(यन प्रशोगढ (उत्तर प्रदेश)	वहीं -
) b	-वहीं	३७५ -सासनी (ग्र ० आ०)	श्री लक्ष्मी नारायम पुत्र भग मिह, ग्राम नाला सद्दा, पो० सामनी, श्रालीगत, (उत्तर प्रवेण)।	वर्लो
7	– वक्री·-∼	३७ ४ - ⊶ध्रतरौली	श्री सोमदत्त , गाव सोदी,पा० पात्री सुकीमपुर, जिला द्वलीगढ़ (उत्तर प्रदेश) ।	—वही -
8	- वही	3 7 +∽~क्र स्त्रीशक्	श्री के०के० ¤स० स्टब्स १७८, सरीय ज्याव प्रजीगद्य (उत्तर प्रदेश)।	–प्रही⊷
9	वर्हा	3 <i>71কা</i> ল (মৃ০সা০)	श्री मोतीसिह, मोहल्ला दहबी दरवाजा श्रलीसक् (उत्तर प्रदेश) ।	अही
0	- वहीं <i>-</i>	375- इंगलाम	श्री गुलबीर सिंह, ग्राम व पो० ऐंदलपुर, श्रक्षीगढ (उत्तर प्रदेश) ।	वहीं
1	বস্তী	378- - जैव र	श्री क्रुंपाल सिंह क्रुंग्ली, डा० खास, जिला क्रुलस्वगहर (उत्तर प्रदेश)।	त्रहो
2	वही- ⁻	३ <i>७ ५</i> - जु र्जी	श्री लक्ष्मन, गाव दयानतपुर, जिला बुलन्दशहर (उत्तर प्रदेश) ।	वही
3	वहीं- <i>-</i>	. <i>:179- - ন্ডু</i> র্দা	श्री (बंगस स्वल्प, मी० राधाकुण्ण, शुभा, उत्तर प्रदेण ।	अह ी
l	जही	18 0—- ফিলার্চ	श्री नन्नुसिक्ष, मो० छोटा झाजार, डिबार्ड, सुलग्वणहर (उत्तर प्रवेस) ।	म हीं

1 2	. 3	4	5
105 उत्तर प्रवेश विधान सभाकः साधारण मिव्यचितः, 1980	381 ₹ मूपशह्र	श्री गिरीश शन्त, ग्रा०, करनपुर कल†, पौ० झनूपशहर, जिला बुलन्दशहर, (उत्तर प्रदेश)।	निक्षणनः वययों काः सेखाः दाखि नहीं -जिया
10 ह वाही	381	श्री प्रताप सिंह, एक्षोकेट, तह० धनूपशहर. जिला बुलन्दशहर (उत्तर प्रदेश) ।	ब ह्येः
107. —वहीं	381− - श्रन्पशहर	श्री हर प्रसाद, ग्राम हरकारपुर, पो० मखेना, जिला बुलन्दशहर, (उत्तर प्रदेश) ।	 वही ≔
108 बही	383 मगोता	श्री मश्दुल मलीम खां, मो० पाठक जहांगीराबाद, जिला बुलच्यमह र (उत्तर प्रदेश) ।	वही
109 बही	383 ग्रगीता	श्री शफीक झहमद, ग्रा ० व पो० परतापुर, जिला युलन्दगहर (उत्तर प्रदेश)।	— वहो →
110वहो	384 बुलस्टशहर	श्री गुपफार, मीहल्ला भुन्देदों, गु लावटी, बुलम्दज हर, उसर प्रदेश ।	जहाे -
11वही	38 <i>5−−</i> शिकारपुर (भ ०ः	ज्ञा०) श्री गनेशीलाल. कस्त्रा जहांगीराबाद, पो० जहांगीराबाद, जिला बुलन्यज्ञाहर (उक्तर प्रवेश)।	वही
12. ⊶-बही	385— विकारकुर ' (ग्र∘जा०)	श्री विज्ञा भूषण, प्राम रसीदपुर, पो० रहमापुर, स्यावसी, जिला बुलम्दशहर, उत्तर प्रदेश ।	~-व ही -
13, —-वही	387वादशी	श्री घोमसीर, प्राम जननेद्रपुर, पौ० जाएंचा; जिसा गाजियाबाद (उत्तर प्रदेश) ।	वर्द्धा
14वही	387 दावरी	श्री भीज सिंह, माटी, ग्राम बद्गुरा, पो० दादरी, जिला गाजियाबाद (उत्तर प्रवेश) ।	मझी
1 5∙ बही	387 वादरी	श्री समयसिंह रावल, ग्राम व पो० न्याइगंज, वावरी, जिला गाजियाबाव, उत्तर प्रवेश ।	वहीं
1 6 बही	388 गजियाबाद	श्री मंकर नानाजी, 86, हरदेव सहाम, गाजियाबाद (उत्तर प्रदेश) ।	- व ही∕-
1 7. — पह ीय —	3 8 ८ ग्राजिम्हावाद	श्री गौवान सिंह, ग्राम व पो० गुलघर गढ़ी, गाजियाबाद (उत्तर प्रदेश) ।	· व हो
18 अही	389-∼भुरावनगर	श्री महेंग्ब्र सिंह, ग्राम नगला, फिरोजपुर, मोहनपुर, डा० श्रटौर, जिला गाजियाबाद, उत्तर प्रदेश।	वही

1	2	3	4	5
	तर प्रवेश विधान सभा का घारण मिन्नीचन, 1980	389 मुरादनगर	श्री राजिन्द्र ग्रायँ, कस्त्रा मिनाड़ी, जिला गाजियाबाद, उन्तर प्रदेश ।	निर्वाचन व्ययों कालेखा दाखिल नहीं किया।
120-	वही	389∼− मुरादनगर	श्री सुरेंद्रकुमार त्यागी, ग्राम व डा० डिडोली, जिला गाजियाबाद (उत्तर प्रदेश) ।	· ~ वही -
121.	 ब ही	39 8- – खरखो वा	श्री देवराजसिंह, ग्राम सरीली, डा० चरसौरा, जिला मुरावाबाव (उत्तर प्रदेश)।	व ही
22-	वहीं —	39 8धारखी षा	श्री शिवकुमार, ग्राम व डा० विजौनी, जिला भेरठ (उत्तर प्रदेश) ।	∽ व ही
123.	— - व र्श्री	393किनैर	श्री महकारसिंह, नि० छुछाई, तह० भवाना, जिला भेरठ (उत्तर प्रदेश) ।	वर्षी
24.	—-वहीं	393 किमैर	श्री मौ० मुफरान, नि० रसूलपूर, तह० भवाना, जिला मेरठ (उ.९ र प्रवेश)।	-व र्ही
1 2 5.	वही	393किनैर	श्री यूनस, नि० पचपेड़ा. तह० मेरठ, जिला मेरठ, उत्तर प्रदेश ।	- व ि

[सं० 76/उ०प्र०वि०स०/80]

ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA

ORDERS

Now Dolhi, the 7th November, 1981

O.N. 8.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that each of the contesting candidates specified in column (4) of the Table ballow at the election to the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly as specified in column (2) and held from the constituency specified in column (3) against his name has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses at all, as shown in column (5) of the said Table as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951 and the Rules made thereunder;

And, whereas, the said candidates have either not furnished any reason or explanation for the said failure even after due notice or the Election Commission, after considering the representations made by them, if any, is satisfied that they have no good reason or justification for the said failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10-A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the persons—specified in column (4) of the Table below to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being a member of either House of the Parliament—or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of 3 years from the date of this order.

TABLE

Sl. No.	Particulars of election	S. No. & name of the assembly constituency.	Name & address of the contest- ing candidate	Reason for disqualification
1	2	3	4	5
1.	General Election to Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assem- bly, 1980	19—Afzalgarh	Shri Mathura, Village & P.O. Rohar, Distt.—Blinor (U.P.)	Failure to lodge any account of election expenses.
2.	-Do-	20-Nagina (SC)	Shri Fatch Chand, Village Mustafabad, Garhi, Mo. Sikhakhuchand, Tehsil-Nagina, Distt.—Blinor (U.P.).	-Do-

1	2	3	4	5
3.	General Election to Pradosh Legislative A 1980.		Shri Ram Dev, Village Bairampur, P.O. Karahiya Bazar, Distt. Rae Bareili, U.P.	Failure to ledge any account of election expenses.
4	-Do-	116—Rampur Khas	Shri Ram Garib, Vill. & P.O. Amawan, Distt. Pratapgarh, U.P.	-Dc-
5.	-Do-	-De-	Shri Ram Ratan, Villago & P.O. Agai, Distt. Pratap garh, U.P.	-Do-
б.	-Do-	117—Gadwara	Shri Khalik, Mch. Salyyadan, Pratapgarh City, Pratapgarh, U.P.	-D c-
7	-1)0-	118—Pratapgarh	Shri Haribax, Ghatampur, Bhac'ohi, Distt,—Pratapgarb, U.P.	-De-
1.	-Do-	119—Birapur	Shri Awadhesh Narayan, Village Molani, P.O. Shitalganj, Distt. Pratapgarn, U.P.	-Do-
9,	-Do-	-Do-	Shri Sahtu Ram, Village Kalimuradpur, P.O. Katruali, Distt.—Pratapgarh, U.P.	-Do-
10	-Do-	120—Patti	Shri Khalik, Saiyyadan, Pratapgarh Chy, Pratapgarh, U.P.	-Do-
11	-Do-	-Do-	Shri Shri Prasad, Village Chandpur, P.O.—Hariharganj Pratapgarh, U.P.	-Do-
12	-Do-	124—Issaulı	Shri Suresh Kumar, Vill. & P.O. Agai, Sultanpur, U P.	-Do-
13	-Do-	133—Tanda	Shri Santhaksh, Village Kotwa Mahmudpur, P.O. Akharpur, Distt.—Faizabad, U.P.	-Do-
14.	-Do-	158Sadullanaga-	Shri Noor Ali Khan, Maraila, Sadullanagar, Gonda U.P.	-De-

1	2	3	4	5
15.	Goneral Election to Pradesh Legislative A 1980		Shri Lalit Narayandutt. Verma, Pipra Ismail, Sadullanagar, Gonda, U.P.	Failure to lodge any account of election expenses.
1ó.	-Do-	159—Mankapur (SC).	Shri Jibrakhan, Village & P.O. Babhani, Kanungo, Distt. Gonda, U.P.	-Do-
17.	-Do-	162—Katra Bazar	Shri Shiva Ranı Shukla, Village Poore Pureniya, P.O. Bangal, Distt. Gonda, U.P.	-Do-
18.	-Do-	163—Colonelganj.	Shri Nanhu urf Nandu Yadav, Village & P.O. Teorasi, Distt. Gonda, U.P.	-Do-
19.	-Do-	-Do-	Shri Ram Pal, Village & P.O. Liloi Kalan, Distt. Gonda, U.P.	- Do-
20,	-Do-	164—Dixir (\$C)	Shri Mangal Prasad, Village Lalpur, P.O. Rampur, Distt. Gonda, U.P.	-De-
21.	-Do-	168 — Ba sti.	Shri Toj Bahadur Singh, Village Wedaria Bujing, P.O. Purani Basti, Distt. Basti, U.P.	-Do-
22.	-Do-	-Do-	Shri Surendra Bahadur Singh, Village Katruwabir Singh, P.O. Pipra Gautam, Distt. Basti, U.P.	-Do-
23.	-Do-	-Do-	Shri Pancham, Khatik-tola, P.O. Purani Basti, Distt. Basti, U.P.	-Do-
24.	Do-	169—Ramnagar,	Shri Ram Milan, Village Pakri Bhikhi, P.O. Belhara, Distt. Basti, U.P	-Do- _,
25	-Do-	-Do-	Shri Shriram, Village Khatiktola, P.O. Purani Basti, Distt. Basti, U.P.	-Do-
26	5, -Do	-Do-	Shri Samillah, Village Pipra, P.O. Karmahiya, Distt, Bastl, U.P.	-Do-

1	2	3	4	5
27.	General Election to Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly, 1980.	170 –Dumartaganj	Shri Nayab Haidar. Vill. & P.O. Hallor, Distt. Basti, U.P.	Failure to lodge any account of election expenses.
28.	-Do-	*Do-	Shri Shiv Dulare Lal, Village Semuwahadeeh, P.O. Hallor, Distt, Basti, U.P.	-Do-
29.	-Do-	171—Itwa	Shri Girja Prasad, Village Samari, P.O. Mahadev Ghurhu, Distt. Basti, U P.	-Do-
30.	-Do-	-Da-	Shri Vijay Bahadur, Villago Karwatiya, P.O. Tirabgehar, Distt. Basti, U P	-Do-
31.	-Do-	172—Shoharatgarh	Moh Azhai Khan, Village Malgahiya, P.O. Dhokhari, Distt. Basti, U.P.	-Do-
g2,	-Do-	-De-	Shri Samundar Prasad, Villago Mehvoli, P.O. Santora Naugarh, Distt. Basti, U.P.	-Do-
33.	-Do-	173Naugarh	Shri Ram Shankar Chaudhury, Vill. & P.O. Sohaskhas, Distt. Basti U P.	-De-
34.	-Do-	174— B ansi	Shri Jagdamba, Vill. Kharchola Naukar, P.O. Bansi, Distt. Basti, U P	-Do-
35.	-Do-	175—Khasrsha	Shri Rannu, Village Bidhar Docha, P.O. Surwarkalar, Disti Basti, U.P.	-Do-
36.	-De-	176—Monhdawal	Shri Kunwar Ranjeet Singh, Village Dhankasia, P.O Nigi, Distt. Basti, U.P.	-Do-
37	-D∩-	-Da-	Shri Prahlad Pandey, Village Kanti, P.O Menhadawal, Disti Basti, U.P.	-D(-
38.	•Do-	178— Hainsarbazar	Shri Sahdev, Village Bampur, P O. Madhopur No. 2, Distt, Basti, U.P.	-Do-

t	2	3	4	5 .
39.	General Election to Pradesh Legislative A 1980.		Shri Udalbhan, Village & P.O. Kanicha, Distt. Gorakhpur, U.P.	Failure to lodge any account of election expenses
4 0.	-Do-	-Do-	Shri Gangasagar Singh, Vill, & P.O. Bhupgarh, Distt. Gorakhpur, U.P.	-Do-
4 1.	-Do-	194Naurnangia (SC).	Shri Shiv Charan, Dargauli, P.O. Chhitauni, Distt. Deorla, U.P.	-Do-
42.	-Do-	195—Ramkola	Shri Tarkeshwar, Vill. Bagha Khurd P.O. Lakshmiganj, Distt. Deoria, U.P.	-Do-
4 3.	-Do-	-Do-	Shri Sohrab, Vill. Padri, P.O. Parsauna, Deoria Pandey, Distt, Deoria, U.P.	-Do-
44.	- D o-	196—Hata (SC).	Shri Harish Chander, Vill. Deukali, P.O. Sirsia, No.3, Distt. Deuaria, U.P.	-Do-
45.	-Do-	267—Meja (SC)	Shri Nachkoo Ram, Village & P.O. Lotadh, Distt. Allahabad, U.P.	-Da-
46.	Do.	268Karchana	Shri Manikchandra Varma, Village Katholi, Allahabad, U.P.	Do.
47 .	Do.	-Do-	Shri Raghuraj Singh Patel, Village Dandí, P.O. Rokri, Allahabad, U.P.	Ďo.
48.	Do.	270—Jhusi	Shri Ram Shiromani, Village Jamunipur, Allahabad, U.P.	Do.
49.	Do.	271—Handia	Shri Chhabinath Pandey Vaidik, Village Jalalpur, P.O. Mardapur, Tehsil Handia, Allahabad, U.P.	Do.
5 0.	Do.	Do.	Shri Prem Shankar, Village Madhopur Siyadeeh, P.O. Baraut, Tohsil Handia, Allahabad, U.P.	Do.

1	2	3	4	5
51.	General Election to U Pradesh Legislative A 1980		Shri Ram Kishore, Village Shahri Bojh, P.O. Madwa, Allahabad, U.P.	Failure to lodge any account of election expenses
52.	Do	272Pactapur	Shri Narottam, Village Semari, P.O. Pratappur, Allahabad, U.P.	Do
53.	Do.	Do.	Shri Rasid Hussain, (15 Darashah, Alam Ali) Allahabad, —Now— 513-B, New Basti, Sadar Bazar, Lucknow, U.P.	Do.
54.	Do.	273—Saraon	Shri Jamuna Prasad, Village Raninar, P.O. Maharwoorld, Tehsil Soraon, Allahabad, U.P.	Do.
53.	Do.	Do.	Shri Radhey Shyam Verma, Village Rampur, Urf Daulatpur, P.O. Sikandra, Tehsil Phoolpur, Allahabad, U.P.	Do.
56.	Do.	275—Allahabad North	Shri Nand Lal Chaube, 19, Gumati Mahatma Mahatma Gandi Marg, Aliahabad, U.P.	Do.
57.	Do.	276—Allaha bad South	Shri Mahendra Singh, 113, Pandariba, Allahabad, U.P.	Do.
58.	Do.	Do.	Shri Rajan urf Raju, Agriculture Institute, Mahawa West, Allahabad, U.P.	Do.
59.	Ďo.	277—Allahabad West	Shri Bansdov, Village Tiyara, P.O. Ganja, Distt, Allahabad, U.P.	Do.
60.	Do.	Do.	Shri Bindeshwari Prasad Kushwaha, Manderdeh Mafi, Allahabad, U.P.	Do.
61.	Do.	Do.	Shri Brajesh Kumar, 304, Mamfordganj, Allahabad, U.P.	Do.

1	2	3	4	5
62.	General Electrion to Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly 1980	177—Allah ibad West	Shri Rotan Prakash urf Bhullu, 14-Katra Road, Allahabad, U.P.	Failure to lodge any account of election expenses.
63,	Do.	Do.	Shri Harish Chandra, Chayal Khas, Allahabad, U.P.	Do.
64.	Do.	279Manjhanpur (SC)	Shri Puran Mal, Village & P.O. Guvara, Talyyadpur Tehsil Manjhanpur, Allahabad, U.P.	Do.
65.	Do.	282—Kishun,pur (SC)	Shrimati Janak Dulari, Urf Vitan Devi H. No. 24, Pagambarpur, Keslia Bindki, Fatehpur, U.P.	Do.
66.	Do.	284— Fet eh yur	Shri Karunashankar Vill. Lalipur, Hussamganj, Distt. Fatchpur, U.P.	
67.	Do.	286 Bindki	Shri Mangal, Village Bhaunpur, P.O. Gohar, Distt. Fatchpur, U.P.	Do.
68.	Do.	301—Aurafya	Shri Jagat Narayan, Moh. Ruhai, Town-Auraiya, Distt. Etawah, U.P.	Do.
69.	Do.	303—Lakhana (SC)	Shri Brij Kishore, Shankhwar, 62, Akalganj, Etawah, U.P.	Do.
70.	Do.	305—Jaswantnagar	Shri Ram Das Bajpayce, Narhauli Bhidruha, Havera, Etawah, U.P.	Do.
71.	Do.	Do.	Shri Gyanendra Kumar Dube, Boralokpur, Etawah, U.P.	Do.
72.	Do,	306—Bharthana Naga	Shri Ujagar Singh, Naga Sultanpur Manja Dota Mafi P.O. Umrans, Distt. Etawah, U.P.	Do.
73.	Do.	D o	Shri Prem Singh, Village Parroli Odampur, P.O. Lakhmi, Distt. Etawah, U.P.	Do.

I	2	3	4	5
	oral Election to U dosh Legislative A		Shri Manmohan Ram, Village Arma Kueli, P.O. Arma Katra, Distt. Etawah, U.P.	Failure to lodge any acount of election expenses
75.	Do.	307—Vidhuna	Shri Ramchander Yadav, Village Makkan Kapurva, P.O. Malhosi, Etawah, U.P.	Do.
76.	Do.	Do.	Shri Shivdayal Vetma, Vill. Puruania, P.O. Pumanbhira, Etawah, U.P.	Do.
77.	Do.	309 Umarda	Shri Balram Siugh, S/o Shri Miyaji Lal, Niwasi Gopcharypur, (Balanpur), P.O. Balanpur, Distt. Farrukhabad, U.P.	Do.
78.	Do.	Do.	Shri Ranbir Singh, S/o Shri Ramsuchilal, Niwasi Savrikh, P.O. Saurikh, Distt. Farrukhabad, U.P.	Do.
79.	Do.	311Kamalganj	Shri Janardhan, Vill. Kiratpur, Yakutganj, Farrukhabad, U.P.	Do.
80.	Do.	Do.	Shri Vinod Dutt, Rajipur, Farrukhabad, U.P.	Do.
81.	Do.	312—Farrukha bad	Shri Aftab Ali Khan, Katra Boo Ali Khan, Distt. Farrukhabad, U.P.	Do.
82.	Do.	313—Karimganj	Smt. Shanti, W/o Shri Satya Prakash, Dube Niwas, Fatchpur, Porigoli, Kayamganj, Distt. Farrukhabad, U.P.	Do.
83.	Do.	314—Mohamdabad	Shri Namavar Singh Rathore, Village Samethipur, P.O. Kanasi, Distt. Farrukhabad, U.P.	Do.
84.	Do.	328—Jhansi	Shri Chhabhi Lal, 4, Gopal Neara, Jhansi, U.P.	Do.

1	2	3	4	5
P	eneral Election to Uradesh Legislative Ass 1980		Shri Hari Ram, 58, Village Vichhor, Jhansi, U.P.	Pailure to lodge any account of election expenses.
86.	Do.	345—Sakit	Shri Sone Lal, Vill. Bhikpura, P.O. Bhujpura, Etah, U.P.	Do.
87.	Do.	346—Soron	Shri Promod Kumar Gupta, Amarpur, Etah, U.P.	Do
88.	Do.	Do.	Shri Raghuraj Singh, Nagla Badan, P.O. Baznagar, Distt. Etah, U.P.	Do.
89.	Do.	347Kasganj	Shri Jai Dayal Singh, Ajudhya Bhawan, Gate, Kasganj, Etah, U.P.	Do.
90.	Do.	Do.	Shri Rajoshwar Singh, Vill. Narauli, P.O. Kisrauli, Distt. Etah. U.P.	Do.
91.	Do.	348—Etah	Shri Chandan Singh, Village Negla Prem, P.O. Om, Distt. Etah. U.P.	Do.
92.	Do.	Do.	Shri Lakhan Singh, P.O. S. S. Yadav, Agra Road, Etah, U.P.	Do.
93.	Do.	350—Jalesat (SC)	Shri Babu Lal, Moh. Akbarpur Havell, Kasba Jalesar, Etah, U.P.	Do.
94.	Do.	368—Hathras	Shri Nanhey Neta urf Sitaram Gali Bakhtawar, Hathras, U.P.	Do.
95.	Do.	369—Sasni (SC)	Dr. Yadram Singh, Villago Vakayan, P.O. Hasayan, Aligarh, U.P.	Do.
96.	Do.	Do.	Shri Lakshmi Narayan, S/o Bhup Singh, Village Nagla Sadda, P.O. Sasni, Aligarh, U.P.	D o.

1	2	3	4	5
97. G Pra 198	eneral Election to Uttar desh Legislative Assemble 0.	372Atrauli y,	Shri Som Dutt, Village Tori, P.O. Palimukimpur, Distt. Aligarh, U.P.	Failure to lodge any account of election expenses.
98.	Do.	373—Aligarh	Shri K.K. S. Bhalla, 778-Sarai Nawab, Aligarh, U.P.	Do
99.	Do.	374—Koil (SC)	Shri Moti Singh, Mohalla Delhi Qarwaza, Aligarh, U.P.	Do.
100.	Do.	375—Iglas	Shri Gulbir Singh, Village & P.O. Adilpur, Aligarh, U.P.	Do.
101.	Do.	378—Jewar (SC)	Shri Kirpal Singh, Kurli, P.O. Khas, Distt. Bulandshahr, U.P.	Do.
102.	ро.	379—Khurja	Shri Lakshman, Village Dayanatpur, Distt. Bulandshahr, U.P.	Do.
103.	Do.	Do.	Shri Bishan Swaroop, Moh. Radha Krishan, Khurja, U.P.	Do.
104.	Do.	380—Debai	Shri Nannu Singh, Moh. Chhota Bazar, Bebai, Bulandshahr, U.P.	Do.
105.	Do.	381—Anupshahr	Shrl Girish Chand, Vill. Karanpur Kalan, P.O. Anupshahr, Distt. Bulandshahr, U.P.	Do. _.
106.	Do.	Do.	Shri Pratap Singh, Advocate, Tehsil Anupshahr, Distt. Bulandshahr, U.P.	Do.
107.	Do.	Do.	Shri Har Prasad, Village Hardwarpur, P.O. Makhena, Distt. Bulandshahr, U.P.	Do.
108.	De	Agota	Shri Abdul Alim Khan, Moh. Pathak, Jehangirabad, Bulandshahr, U.P.	Do.
109.	Do.	Do.	Shri Shafiq Ahmed, Vill. & P.O . Partapur, Bulandshahr U.P.	Do.

1	2	3		
	eral Election to Uttar lesh Legislative Assembly).	384—Bulandshahr ',	Shri Gaffar, Moh. Kundechhan, Gulanathi, Bulandshahr, U.P.	Failure to lodge any account of election expenses.
111.	Do.	385—Shikarpur (SC)	Shri Ganeshi Lal, Kaslla Jahangirabad, P.O. Jahangirabad, Distt. Bulandshahr, U.P.	Do.
112.	Do.	Do.	Shri Vidyabhushan, Vill. Rasidpur, P.O. Rahmapur, Syamali, Distt. Bulandshahr, U.P.	Do.
113.	Do.	387—Dadri	Shri Omvir, Vill. Jamshedpura, P.O. Jarcha, Distt. Ghaziabad, U.P.	Do.
114,	Do.	Do.	Shri Bhimsingh Bhatti, Village Badhpura, P.O. Dadri, Distt. Ghazlabad, U.P.	Do.
115.	Do.	Do.	Shri Samyasingh Rewal, Vill, & P.O. Naydarganj, Dadri, Distt. Ghaziabad, U.P.	Do.
116.	Do.	388—Ghaziabad	Shri Shankar Naneji, 86—Hardev Sahay, Ghaziabad, U.P.	Do.
117.	Do.	Do.	Shri Shodan Singh, Vill. & P.O. Guldhar, Ghadh, Ghaziabad, U.P.	Do.
118.	Do.	389—Muradnagar	Shri Mahindra Singh, Village Nagla Ferozpur Mohanpur, P.O. Atour, Distt. Ghazlabad, U.P.	Do.
119.	Do.	Do.	Shri Rajindra Anja, Kasha Niwadi, Distt. Ghaziabad, U.P.	Do.
120.	Do.	Do.	Shri Surendra Kumar Tyagi, Vill. & P. O. Didoli, Distt. Ghazlabad U.P.	Do.
121.	Do.	398—Khar Banda	Shri Dev Raj Singh, Village Tarauli, P.O. Chartaura, Distt. Moradabad, U.P.	Do.

1	2	3	4	5 ,
	neral Election to Utter Pradesh gislative Assembly, 1980	398 -Khur Banda	Shri Shiv Kumar, Vill ge & P.O. Bijauli, Distt. Meerut, U.P.	Failure to ladge any account of election expenses.
123.	Do.	393—Kithore	Shri Makhar Singh, R/o Chhuchhai, Tehsil Mawana, Distt. Mecrut, U.P.	Do.
124.	Do.	Do.	Shri Mohd. Goofran, R/o Rasulpur, Tehsil Mawana, Distt. Meerut, U.P.	Do.
125.	Do.	Do,	Shri Yunus, R/o Pachpera, Tehsil Meerut, Distt. Meerut, U.P.	Do.

[No. 76/UP-LA/80]

श्राब्बाठ.-- 9--निर्वाधन मायोग का समाधान हो गया है कि नीचे की सारणों के स्तम्म (2) में यथा विनिर्विष्ट उत्तर प्रवेश राज्य सभा के निर्वाधन के लिए जो स्तम्भ (3) में विनिर्विष्ट निर्वाधन क्षेत्र से हुआ है, स्तम्भ (4) में उसके सामने विनिर्विष्ट निर्वाधन लड़ने वाला प्रत्येक भ्रम्ययों लोक प्रतिनिधिष्ट अधिनियम, 1951 तथा तद्धी- बनाए गए नियमों हारा अपेक्षित समय के भीतर और रीति में उस्त सारणी के स्तम्भ (5) में यथा उपर्वशित रूप में प्रपने निर्वाधन क्यायों का लेखा दाखिल करने में असफल रहा है:

ग्रीर अक्त ग्रभ्यायियों ने सम्यक भूकना दिए जाने पर भी अकन भ्रमफलेना के लिए या तो कोई कारण भ्रथवा स्पन्धीकरण मही दिया है या उनके ग्रार दिए गए भ्रभ्यावेदकों पर, यदि कोई, हो, दिचार करने के पर्वजन् निर्यावन भ्रायोग का यह समाद्यान ही गंथा है कि उनके पास उक्त प्रसक्तन। के लिए कोई पर्यापन कारण या भ्यायीविषय नहीं है;

भ्रतः भ्रवः निर्वाचन भ्रायोग उक्त भ्रधिनियम की धारा 10-क के भ्रतुसरण में नीचे की सारणी के स्तम्म (4) में विनिर्दिष्ट व्यक्तियों को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान सभा अयत्र विधान गरिषद् के सदस्य चुने जाने भीर होने के लिए इस भ्रावेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की का गविध के लिए निर्महन घोषित करना है।

सारजी

त्रम सं	निर्वाचन की विशिष्टियां	विधान सभा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र की अभ्य संख्या ब्रीट नाम	निर्वाचन लड़ने वाले भ्रम्यर्थी का नाम भीर पंता	निरहेंसा का कारण
1	2	3	4	5
1.	उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा का साधारण निवित्तन, 1980	13 मैनीताल	श्री पूरन चन्द्र, महाबीरगंज, हलद्वानी, जिला नैनीताल, (उसर प्रदेश)।	निर्वावन व्ययों का लेखा रोति से दाखिल नहीं किया है।
2.	वहीं- - -	64জনালাশবি	श्री राम किशोर, ग्राम व पो० मिर्जापुर, जिला णाहजहापुर, (उत्तर प्रदेश) ।	लेखा अपेक्षित समय के भ्रन्दर तथा रीति से दाखिल नहीं किया है।
3.	वहो -	72 विधासंव	श्री फूल सिंह, ग्राम हरवटा, पोठ चन्वचौकी, जिला खारी (उत्तर प्रवेश)।	निर्वाचन व्ययों का लेखा श्रपेक्षित समय के श्रम्बर तथा रीति से दाखिल नहीं किया है।

1	2	3	4	5
4.	मही	116—-रामपुर श्रास	श्री स्थाम लाल, प्राम व पो० रेहुधा, लालगंज, प्रतापगढ़, (उत्तर प्रदेश)।	लेखा रीति से वाखिल महीं किया है।
5.	वही -	158 মশকাপুৰ (গ্ৰহ জাত)	श्री त्रिलोकी, ग्राम पक्डीहवा, धनेप्रवरपुर, पो० करवा, जनपद, गोंडा (उत्तर प्रदेश)।	लेखा रीति से दाखिल नहीं किया है।
6.	वही	329विभीना (ग्र०जा०)	श्री घनश्यामदास वर्मा, ग्राम मो ड्खुर्ग , तह० मोंट, झांसीं (उत्तर प्रदेश) ।	लेखा अपेक्षित समय के अंदर तथा रीति से वाखिल नहीं किया है।
7.	- जही -	384∼-धुलन्दशहर	श्री राजेन्द्रपाल शर्मा, ग्राम एतभावसराय,, पो० चन्द्रपुरा, जिला बुलस्दशहर (उत्त,र प्रदेश) ।	लेखा रीति से वाखिल नहीं किया ӄ
8.	वही	423 मस्रो	श्री कल्लूमल, हनुमानषाट मोतीबाजार, हरिद्वार, जिला सहारनपुर, (उसरप्रदेश)।	ले का घपेक्षित समय के घ न्दर तथा रीति से दाखिल नहीं किया है।

[सं० 76/उ०प्र. ०वि०स०/80]

O.N.9.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that each of the contesting candidates specified in column (4) of the Table below at the election to the Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly as specified in column (2) and held from the constituency specified in column (3) against his name has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses within the time and in the manner, as shown in column (5) of the said Table as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951 and the Rules made thereunder;

And, whereas, the said candidates have either not furnished any reason or explanation for the said failure even after due notice or the Election Commission, after considering the representations made by them, if any, if satisfied that they have no good reason or justification for the said failure;

Now, Therefore in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declareas the persons specified in column (4) of the Table below to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being a member of either House of the Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of 3 years from the date of this order.

TABLE

Sl.	Particulars of election	Sl. No. & Name the Assembly Constituency	Name & address of the contest- ing candidate	Reason for disqualification.
1	2	3	4	5
1.	General Election to Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly, 1980	13—Nainital	Shri Puran Chandra, Mchahirbanj, Haldwani, District Nainital (U.P.)	Failure to lodge the account in the manner required by law
2.	Do.	64—Jalalabad	Shri Ram Kishore, Vill. & P. O. Mirzapur, Distt. Shajhahanpur U.P.	Failure to lodge the account, within the time and in the mann- ner required by law.
3.	Do.	72—Nighason	Shri Phool Singh Vill. Harbatta P.O. Chandchouki Distt. Kherl U.P.	Do.

1	2	3	4	5
4.	General Election to Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly, 1980	116—Rampur Khas	Shri Shyam Lal Village & P.O. Rehuwa Lalgan Pratapgarh, U.P.	Fallure to lodge the account in i, the manner required by law.
5.	Do.	159—Mankapur (SC)	Shri Triluki, Pakdihama Dhaneshwarpur, P.O. Karda, Janpad, Gonda, U.P.	Do.
6.	Do.	329—Babina (SC)	Shri Ghanshyam Dass Verma, Vill. Modkhurd, Tehsil Ma ^t h, Jhansi, U.P.	Failure to lodge the account within the time and in the manner required by law.
7.	Do.	384—Bulandshahr	Shri Gajenderpal Sharma, Vill. Atmadsarai, P.O. Chandpura, Distt. Bulandshahr, U.P.	Failure to lodge the account in the manner required by law.
8.	Do.	423—Musoorie	Shri Kallu Mal, Hanumanghat, Motibazar, Haridwar, Distt. Saharanpur, U.P.	Failure to lodge the account within the time and in the man- ner required by law

[No. 76/UP-LA/80]

नई बिल्ली, 31 विसम्बर, 1981

ष्मा० १४०..... :---लोक प्रतिनिधित्य घिधिनियम, 1951 (1951 का 43) की घारा 106 के धनुसरण में, निर्वाचन आयोग 1981 की निर्वाचन प्राणी संख्या 1 में लखनऊ उच्च त्यायालय के नारीख 12-10-81 का निर्णय एनव्हारा प्रकाशित करता है।

[82/उ०प्र०/1/81/(जक०) क्यो० ना० नागर, अवर सचिव भारत निर्वाचन आयोग

New Delhi, the 31st December, 1981

O.N. 10.—In pursuance of Section 106 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951, (43 of 1951) the Election Commission hereby publishes the judgment dated the 12th October, 1981 of the High Court of Judicature at Lucknow in Election Petition No. 1 of 1981.

Court No. 4

Election Petition No. 1 of 1981

With

Civil Misc. Application No. 65(E) of 1981

in re: Sri Dhartipakar Madan Lal Aggarwal

1 ..Petitioner.

Versus

Sri Rajiv Gandhi

.. Respondent.

Hon'ble K. N. Goyal J.

In this election petition directed against the election of Sri Rajiv Gandhi respondent against Lok Sabha from 25-Amethi Lok Sabha Constituency, the sole respondent had entered appearance on 21-9-1981 and submitted an application under VI Rule 16 read with order VII Rule C.P.C., as applied to election petitions by Section 87 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951, praying that various paragraphs of the election petition be struck off and further praying that the election petition itself be dismissed as not disclosing any cause of action. A copy of this application was given to the

petitioner who was present in person on that date, and he was allowed time to reply to the application till 30-9-1981. The petitioner has not submitted any reply to the application. He has also not appeared today although the date was fixed in his presence and no application whatsoever has been received from him. The petitioner was not represented by any counsel.

In the circumstance I have heard the learned counsel for the respondent, Sri H. R. Bhardwaj followed by Sri S. C. Maheshwari, ex-parte.

Shri Bhardawaj has taken me through the entire election petition and has submitted that the allegations on their very face do not fulfil the requirements of law as regards ingredients of alleged corrupt practices. Section 83(1) of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 requires that an election petition shall contain a concise statement of the material facts on which the petitioner relies and shall set forth full particulars of any corrupt practice that the petitioner alleges, including as full a statement as possible of the names of the parties alleged to have committed such corrupt practice and the date and place of the commission of each such practice. Learned counsel has argued that the petition falls short of these requirements.

Section 100 of the Act lays down various grounds for declaring an election to be void. Clause (b) of sub-section (1) relates to the commission of corrupt practices by a returned candidate or his election agent or by any other person with the consent of a returned candidate or his election agent. Clauses (a), (c) and (d) of sub-section (1) contain various other ground for declaring an election to be void. It would thus appear that Section 83 of the Act makes a distinction between allegation of corrupt practices and other ground. So far as the allegations of corrupt practices are concerned full particulars thereof are required to be set out in the petition itself while so far as other allegation, are concerned it is enough to give a concise statement of the material facts on which the petitioner relies. This distinction has been provided for by the legislature for a special reason, namely, that if an election is set aside on the ground of a corrupt practice the returned candidate not only loses his seat but is also liable to be disqualified for future for a certain period vide

sec. 8A. In numerous decisions it has been laid down that allegations of corrupt practices are in the nature of quasi-criminal charges in respect of which not only strict proof is required but specific pleading along with full particulars is also insisted on.

Section 87(1) of the Act lays down that subject to the provisions of this Act and of any rules made thereunder, every election petition shall be tried, as nearly as may be in accordance with the procedure applicable under the Code of Civil Procedure to trial of suits. There is proviso to this sub-section but the same is not relevant at this stage. Subsection (2) is also not relevant. Order VI Rule 4 C.P.C., provides that in all cases in which the particular relies on frund etc., full particulars (with dates and items if necessary) shall be stated in the pleading. Rule 5 of Order VI lays down that a further and better statement of the nature of the claim or defence, or further and better particulars of any matter stated any pleading, may in all cases be ordered, upon such terms, as to costs and otherwise, as may be just. In the light of these provisions it has been consistently held by Courts that as in the case of fraud in a Civil suit full particulars of a corrupt practice should be given in the petition itself as required by Section 83. If, however, the particulars as given in the petition, which should contain all material facts, sufficiently constitute the ingredients of the corrupt practice in question, then further and better particulars could be required to be furnished even after the expiry of the period of limitation for an election petition. If, however, the allegations themselves fall short of the ingredients of the corrupt practices in question, then further particulars cannot be submitted after the expiry of the period of limitation has already expired we have, therefore, to see whether the allegations contained in the election petition are sufficient to constitute the requisite ingredients of the corrupt practices alleged.

In his application the respondent has prayed for the striking out of paras 2 to 55, para 1 being formal.

Para 2 says that on 11-5-1981 the petitioner (who belongs to Madhya Pradesh), arrived in Sultanpur for filing his nomination form and was looking for a proposer. Some prospective proposers were dissuaded by the workers of the respondent but ultimately the petitioner succeded in securing the endorsement of a proposer and completed his nomination form. It has not been stated as to which workers of the respondent dissuaded which person from acting as proposer nor is any corrupt practice indicated in this paragraph. The paragraph, is thus irrelevant.

Paragraphs 3 to 6 are to the effect that the petitioner wanted to file his nomination papers before the Returning Officer after removing all his clothes excepting his Langot. This behaviour of his was considered by some police men to be that of an insane person but ultimately the Returning Officer assured him that the petitioner was free to submit his nomination paper while wearing a Langot only. Accordingly the petitioner did present his nomination paper in that state of dress or undress. These allegations are also clearly irrelevant.

Para 7 says that on 4th and 5th June. 1981 some C.B.I. men started to remain with the petitioner, and two shadows were also attached to him. This merely refers to some security arrangements and has nothing to do with the election petition and is accordingly irrelevant.

Paras 8 to 19 give details of various motor vehicles which were found in the constituency to have been used in support of the election compaign of the respondent with Congress (I) flags. Besides, it is alleged in para 8 that there were arrangements for messing "etc." for the respondents canvassers at the Kothi of Sanjay Singh in Amethi. It is further alleged that the various motor vehicles and the messing arrangements were with the consent of the respondent. These allegations have to be read with those of paras 50 and 51 of the petition in which it has been stated that the respondent spent on his election much more than the ceiling prescribed for a parliamentary election. Para 50(a) of the petition states that at least 100 jeeps were used for 30 days in the Amethi Constituency with the consent of the respondent while in sub-para (b) it has been stated that about 40 jeeps were used in the Constituency in support of the election campaign of the respondent for 30 days. Apart from the fact that the number of vehicles mentioned in paras 8 to 19 and the number of days on which the vehicles were used differ materially from what is alleged

in para 50(a) (b), what is significant is that it has not been alleged in these paragraphs that the respondent either by himself or by his election agent incurred or authorised any expenditure on the use of these vehicles. It may be noted in this connection that in Section 77(1) the following Explanation was inserted by Act No. 58 of 1974 namely:—

"Explanation 1.—Notwithstanding any judgment, order or decision of any court to the contrary, any expenditure incurred or authorised in connection with the election of a candidate by a political party or by any other association or body of persons or by any individual (other than the candidate or his election agent) shall not be deemed to be, and shall not ever be deemed to have been, expenditure in connection with the election incurred or authorized by the candidates or by his election agent for the purposes of this sub-section."

The proviso to this Explanation is not relevant. Explanation-2 lays down for the purposes of Explanation-1 "political party" shall have the same meaning as in the Election Symbols (Reservation and Allotment) Order, 1968, as for the time being in force.

Learned counsel for the respondent has rightly urged that if any expenditure was incurred on the alleged use of the vehicles, then, even though the respondent may have consented to that expenditure by the political party or by any other person it would not amount to incurring or authorising of the penditure by the respondent. Mere consent or non-objection to the use of the vehicles in support of his election compaign does not have the legal effect of making the expediture thereon as expenditure incurred or authorised by the respondent, "Authorisation" implies that the candidate took responsibility for reimbursing that expenditure, vide Smt. Indira Gandhi v. Sri Raj Narain A.I.R. 1975 S.C. 2299 (paras 119 and 121). Mere acquiescence or consent of the candidate in respect of any expenditure incurred by his political party or by any friend or well-wisher is not legally sufficient for purposes of section 77 read with section 123(6) of the Act. The same would hold good with regard to messing arrangements at the house of Sanjay Singh It has not been alleged as to who actually incurred the expenditure and whether it was incurred on behalf of or under an authority of the respondent. Only the consent of the respondent is alleged This, as noted above, is not legally sufficient for bringing the case within the four corners of section 123(6) of the Act. Accordingly these allegations do not by themselves constitute the requisite ingredients of the corrupt practice imputed, and as such no evidence can be permitted to be adduced in respect thereof.

Para 20 is to the effect that on 11-6-1981 Smt. Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister, compaigned on behalf of her son, the respondent, by addressing certain meetings in which she exhorted the people to vote for the respondent for the sake of development of the constituency. This has been sought to be elaborated in para 53(i)(a) (b) and (c) of the petition. In the letter sub-paras it has been stated that Smt. Indira Gandhi and other workers of the respondent with the consent of the respondent promised to the electorate that the constituency would be developed if the respondent was elected. This according to those sub-paras, amounted to giving or promising a gift to the voters and also to exercise of undue influence on them. It has also been stated in para 53(1)(a) that a considerable amount was spent on the construction work of Amethi Railway Station about 15 or 20 days before the declaration for poll. The precise language in which the alleged promises were said to have been made by the Prime Minister has not been set out in any of these paragraphs, which was necessary having regard to proviso (b) to sec. 123(2). There is nothing unusual or illegal if a candidate or his supporters promise to the electorate that the candidate if returned would work effectively for the development of his constituency. Thus this paragraph also does not contain any sufficient allegation which may constitute, in the eye of law, any corrurt practice either of gift to voters or of undue influence within the meaning of Section 123(1)(a) (ii) or (2) of the Act nor can any Government expenditure on the railway station be brought within any other provision of the Act.

Paras 21 to 27 give details of the petitioner's own movements between 11-5-1981 and 14-6-1981. Out of them paras 22 to 27 are not even mentioned in the affidavit of the petitioner. Para 21 merely says that the petitioner could not get an interview with the Prime Minister on 11-5-1981. This para is clearly irrelevants and so are paras 22 to 27 which do not disclose any ground for setting aside the election of the respondent

Para 28 states that on 14-5-1981 in the morning hours, he saw at a polling station in a junior High School, Amethi, that one woman who went inside a polling booth for casting her vote was accompanied by any another person. The date 14-5-1981 appears to be a mistake for 14-6-1981, the date of the poll. The allegation, however, clearly vague and does not say anything about the respondent or his election agent, if any. It is thus irrelevant.

Para 29 of the petition states that on the same day, at another polling station in Amethi, he found that at a polling booth of the respondent the electors were being given drinking water and Putashas and that this was being done with the consent of the respondent. The name of the polling station has not been mentioned. The use of the expression 'polling booth' in the context of the respondent is obviously misconceived as a candidate cannot have his polling booth. A polling booth is set up by the Election Department and is part of a polling station, A candidate cannot thus have polling booth. Assuming that what is meant is a camp of the supporters of the respondent, the allegation, a part from vagueness, suffers from the same deficiency as the allegations in parts 8 to 19 discussed above. Here also there is mention of the respondents "consent" but it is not alleged that any expenditure was incurred or "authorised" by the respondent. For the reasons already given in the context of the oforesaid paragraphs this para is also irrelevant.

Para 30, which may be read with Para 53(i)(d) says that on 14-6-1981 at about 2 P.M. the petitioner saw at "a" Junior High School Polling Station that A truck No. U.P.Q. 2299 bearing the flag of the respondent's Party brought about 20 or 22 voters and took them back after they had cast rotes. Earlier the respondent's workers (no names given) had stopped the same truck and the truck owner had not charged any hire from the voters. The allegation is vague inasmuch as the name of the Police Station has not been disclosed. Nor are the names of the voters disclosed. There is no suggestion that the respondent was himself present at the time nor is it stated that talk took place between the "workers" and the truck owner. It has not been alleged in this paragraph that any hire was at all paid to the truck owner. If the truck owner of his own carried any voters gratis the same could not amount to a corrupt practice on the part of the respondent, vide Umed v. Raj Singh A.I.R. 1975 S.C. 43 [Head Note(B)] There is no clear allegation of "PROCURING" either. It has been inferentially added in passing that the truck was "brought by respondent's supporters with his consent". Such an inferential assertion is not premissible as it is not a necessary inference from the basic circumstaces alleged the facts alleged should point unerringly to that conclusion and admit of no other a explanation. Thus the allegation falls short of the ingredients of the corrupt practice specified in Section 123(5) of the Act.

Para 31 of the petition states that on 14-6-1981 at about 3.30 p.m. the petitioner saw at a Junior High School Polling Station in the Amethi Constituency that one person who displayed the "Hand" symbol on his person voted four times. His names was subsequently learnt to be Mahabir. No connection of the said Mahabir with the respondent has been alleged in this paragraph and it has not even been asserted that the petitioner, although an eve witness to this irregularity, made any protest to the Presiding Officer of the Polling Station. The name or precise location of the Junior High School which is said to be situated "within the Amethi Constituency" has also not been identified, nor is voter number (according to the electoral roll) mentioned in respect of Mahabir. Thus this paragraph also falls short of the ingredients of any corrupt practice or of any irregularity.

Para 12 of the petition states that at the Junior High School Amethi Polling Booth, when women voters were going inside along with ballot papers one person used to go with them and to indicate to them to mark their ballot paper against the 'HAND' SYMBOL. The name of that nerson was subsequently learnt to be Dharam Pal. It is further alleged that this man used to drop the ballot papers in the ballot box either himself, or to get the ballot papers in the ballot box either himself, or to get the ballot papers dropped by women voters. Again no connection of Dharam Pal with the respondent has been alleged, beyond suggesting that he was a supporter of the respondent nor is it stated that the retitioner made any protest to the Presiding Officer in regard to this irregularity.

Para 33 states that at the Junior High School Amethi Polling Booth one Jame person who called himself an agent of the Lok Dal used to make complaints to the Presiding Officer who has ever paid no heed to them. The Presiding Officer used to tell Dharam Pal not to commit such an irregularity but after every few minutes Dharam Pal used to include again in the same irregularity. It adds that the petitioner was afraid of making any complaint to the Presiding Officer because of the bad atmosphere prevailing in the constituency. In para 53 (e) (iv) also there is a reference to an atmosphere of terror prevailing in the constituency. The allegations of atmosphere of terror are vague and it is not disclosed as to what caused such an atmosphere to prevail. A mere subjective impression of the petitioner in regard to the existence of the alleged atmosphere of terror cannot raise a triable issue.

Para 34 states that near the Junior High School Amethi Polling station, within a distance of 100 metres from the polling station, the workers of the respondent used to canvass to the voters by showing them signs of the "HAND" symbol. This according to the petitioner, was being done with the consent of the respondent. It is not alleged that the respondent was present at the said polling station. The facts from which an inference of the respondent's consent could be drawn have not been indicated. Neither are the names of the "workers" nor is the time at which the complaint act took place indicated. As such the allegation is clearly vague.

Para 35 states that the petitioner saw many pamphlets and booklets in support of the respondent during the election campaign. There is nothing objectionable about the use of pamphlets and booklets as such. Perhaps the reference to these printed matters has been made in the context of the allegation in para 50(c) in which it has been said that the respondents election literature was printed free" though it should have cost Rs. 50,000,00 or so. There is no allegation at all that any expenditure was actually incurred on the printing of these leaflets etc. Accordingly in view of the legal position discussed earlier, the allegation is totally irrelevant.

Pares 36 to 40, 42 and 43 of the petition are to the effect that the petitioner had appointed a person not previously acquired with him, one Sardar Ram Pal Singh, as election agent with instructions to him not to appoint any counting agents. Inspite of these instructions some nerson were found to have acted as the petitioner's counting agents. If the petitioner's own election agent did not faithfully comply with his instructions or if any stranger wrongly acted as the petitioner's counting agent the matter was between the petitioner and his election agent or such other persons and it has no concern with the respondent. These allegations are thus clearly irrelevant.

Para 41 states that on 15-6-1981 one person came to the petitioner saying that his camera had been taken and that apprehending that his megaphone may also be taken away he had come out of the place of counting. Neither is the name of the person who had taken away his camera nor is the name of the person whose camera was allegedly taken away disclosed, nor is it suggested that the respondent had anything to do with the incident. It has further been stated that the petitioner could not meet his election agent (Sardar Ii) and, therefore, he proceeded to Rae Barell by bus in search of Sardar Ji. The petitioner also apprehended that Sardar Ji might be won over by the respondent's men and fictitious counting agent forms may be got filled in through Sardar Ji on the petitioner's behalf. This allegation is a mere expression of the petitioner's own apprehension or suspicion and does not go bevond it. It is thus entirely irrelevant.

Para 44 says that on 15-6-1981 at the time of counting the petitioner saw that there was a lot of Marpit going on between the supporters of the Lok Dal and the supporters of the respondent. This allegation is also clearly irrelevant as nothing is imputed to the respondent.

Para 45 states that when the police men started beating the respondent's supporters, the respondent's supporters intervened and upon their intervention the police men desisted from beating those workers further. This again does not speak of any objectionable conduct on the part of the respondent or even his supporters. This para further goes on to say that the petitioner also heard that the Lok Dal candidate Sri Sharad Yaday had been arrested by the police. The context in which Sri Yaday was allegedly arrested has not been indicated.

In paras 46. 47 and 48 the petitioner speaks of his efforts to obtain details about appointment of his counting agents from the election officials. His contacts with election officials after the declaration of results have no bearing on the validity of the election.

Para 48 says that on 17-6-1981 i.e. two days after the declaration of the result the said Sardar Ji told the petitioner that he had not appointed any one as a counting agent or a polling agent and had not incurred any expenditure on the election campaign of the petitioner. This again is irrelevant.

Para 49 again refers to the alleged incident of snatching of a camera of an un-named person and of the lodging of a first information report with the police by the said victim. Nothing is imputed either to the election officials or to the respondent in this paragraph and as such it is entirely irrelevant.

Para 50 speaks of expenditure beyond the ceiling limit. Sub-paras (a) (b) and (c) have already been dealt with in the context of the relevant paragraphs in which details of the complained expenditure were rrentioned. In sub-para (d) it is stated that flags and buntings wouth about Rs. 50,000.00 were used in the constituency with the "consent" of the respondent. Again there is no allegation that any expenditure was incurred on these flags and buntings either by or with the authority of the respondent. In sub-para(e) it is said that about Rs. 30,000.00 were spent on the election meetings of the respondent and his workers with his consent. Neither are the names of any workers given nor have the details of the meetings been mentioned, nor has it been said that the money was spent by or with the authority of the respondent. The same is the case with the allegation in the next sub-paragraph in regard to the meetings addressed by Smt. Indira Gandhi on 11-6-1981 on which the expenditure has been estimated as Rs. 1.00.000.00 (one lakh). There has been estimated as Rs. 1.00.000.00 (one lakh). There has been estimated as Rs. 1.00.000.00 (one lakh). There has been estimated as Rs. 1.00.000.00 (one lakh). There has been estimated as Rs. 1.00.000.00 (one lakh). There has been estimated as Rs. 1.00.000.00 (one lakh). There has been estimated as Rs. 1.00.000.00 (one lakh). There has been estimated by the respondent. In the next succeeding subparagraph expenditure on food etc. of the workers of the respondent has been mentioned. It has been said that about 100 persons spent Rs. 5.00 per day for 30 days. Neither the names of the persons are mentioned nor is it said that the expenditure was incurred or authorised by the respondent. We have already seen that in paragraph-8 the petitioner had earlier mentioned that arrangements for food were made at the house of Sanjay Singh but it was not mentioned that Sanjay Singh or anyone else incurred any expenditure under authorisation from the respondent or on his behalf.

Para 51 says that in view of the foregoing details the respondent and his workers spent with his consent about Rs. 3,15,500.00 we have already seen while dealing with paragraph 50 that it does not show any expenditure having been incurred or authorised by the respondent. As such the inference drawn in para 51 is non-sequiter.

In paragraph 52 it is alleged that the petitioner has learnt that in this election at some polling stations the polling had been 100% and that the respondent had obtained at some places as large percentage of votes as 90%. This is a varue assertion and no polling stations have been identified. This has been sought to be elaborated in paragraph-53 (8) in which it has been said that it was learnt that at certain polling booths there had been 100% polling and 100 to 200% votes had been cast by a single person and further that "perhaps" even the signatures of such persons were not obtained (probably what is meant is, on the counter-foil). In sub-paragraph (9) it has been said that at several polling stations the respondent had secured 90% votes. Thus there is bare insinuation about impersonated and books votes having been cast, but there is no specific allegation and no clear averment as to where, when and by whom such impersonation was done or in respect of which voters entered in the electoral roll. Thus the allegations in this regard are also on their face insufficient to constitute any corrupt practice or any irregularity which may be said to have materially affected the election.

Para 53 purports to be a summary of grounds of challenge to the election petition based on the preceding paragraphs, but it appears that in several of the grounds the factual averments referred to earlier have been sought to be elaborated. This was not permissible, the more so when we find that paragraph 53 has not even been verified at the foot of the election petition. However that may be, the relevant allegations have already been dealt with while considering

the earlier paragraphs from 2 to 52, and the same ground need not be covered again.

Paras 54, 56 and 58 are formal, paras 55 and 57 merely state the petitioner's conclusions from the averments in the preceding paragraphs which have already been dealt with.

It has been stated in Nihal Singh V₃. Rao Birendra Singh 1970(3) S.C.C. 239 (Para 8) that where the pleadings are vague and the relevant dates, places etc, are not mentioned no evidence should be permitted to be led as it would leave a wide scope to the petitioner to adduce evidence in respect of an incident any place on any date that he may find convenient or for which he could procure witnesses. This is not permissible.

It is thus clear that the various paragraphs making factual allegations do not contain legally sufficient averments that may be said to be constitutive of the corrupt practices sought to be imputed to the respondent in reference to the election. The said paragraphs are thus unnecessary, fivolous and vexatious within the meaning of Order VI Rule 16(a) and to require the respondent to answer these vague charges or to try these vague and insufficient charges would be an abuse of the process of the Court within the meaning of clause (c) of the said Rule 16.

It may also be noted that the affidavit of the petitioner given in support of the petition is defective insofar as it states that paragraphs 43, 49 and 53 of the petition about the commission of the corrupt practice of obtaining of assistance of persons of Government servants and the particulars given therein are "true to (his) information (six) knowledge". The prescribed form lays down that the allagations should be stated to be either as true to the petitioners knowledge or as true to his information. A vague assertion of an allegation being true to information and knowledge is not permissible.

Accordingly the application [Civil Misc. Application No. 65(E) of 1981] of the respondent is allowed exparte to the extent that paragraphs 2 to 53, 55 and 57 are ordered to be struck out.

In view of the above no triable issue arises from the election petition, and the election petition does not disclose a cause of action. The election petition is accordingly rejected under Order VII Rule 11(a) C.P.C., read with Section 87 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951. As the petitioner is absent today and as the respondent had appeared in Court even before a process was issued to him no order is made as to costs.

Sdl-K. N. GOYAL. 12-10-1981 [No. 82|UP|1|81 (Luck)] O. N. NAGAR, Under Secy. Election Commission of India

नई विल्ली, 28 विसम्बर, 1981

आं० अं० 11 --- लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1951 (1951 का 43) की धारा 13क की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रवस्त सिक्तमों का प्रयोग करते हुए, भारत निर्वाचन प्रायोग, तमिल नाडु सरकार के परामर्श के श्री डी० के० ग्रोझा के छुद्दी चले जाने पर श्री सी० एस० रामाचन्त्रन, उप मचिब, तमिल नाडु सरकार को 28-12-1981 से जब तक श्री डी० के० ग्रोझा जो छुट्टी पर हैं पुन. ग्रपमा कार्यभार सम्माल नहीं लेते तब तक तमिल नाडु राज्य के मुख्य निर्वाचन ग्राधिकारी के रूप में एसद- हाग नाम निर्वेणित करता है।

[सं० 154/सिमलमाड्/81] धादेश से, के० गणेशन, सजिल भारत मिर्वाचन ग्रायोग

New Delhi, the 28th December, 1981

O.N. 11.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 13A of the Representation of the People Act, 1950 (43 of 1950), the Election Commission of India, in consultation with the Government of Tamil Nadu hereby nominates Shri C. S. Ramachandran. Deputy Chief Electoral Officer and Deputy Secretary to the Government as the Chief Electoral Officer for the State of Tamil Nadu with effect from 26-12-1981 and until Shri D. K. Oza, who is on leave, rejoins duty.

By Order,
.K. GANESAN, Secy. Election Commission of India
[No. 154|TN|81]